



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/715,981	11/17/2000	Chris LaRue	SF/0029.01	6682

22470 7590 07/28/2004

HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP
P O BOX 366
HALF MOON BAY, CA 94019

EXAMINER

LE, MIRANDA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2177

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2004

14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/715,981

Applicant(s)

LARUE, CHRIS

Examiner

Miranda Le

Art Unit

2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 May 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 05/13/2004 has been entered.
2. This communication is responsive to Amendment B, filed 05/13/2004.
3. Claims 1-29 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 14, 17, 23 are independent claims. In the Amendment B, no claims have been amended, added, or canceled. This action is made non-Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless:

(e) the invention was described in

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chu et al. (US Patent No. 6,493,720).

Chu anticipated independent claims 1, 14, 17, 23 by the following:

As per claims 1, Chu teaches “receiving a first user input, the first user input selecting a first data item from the second dataset for inheritance into the first dataset” at col. 8, lines 24-40, col. 4, lines 13-50;

“placing a first pointer in the first dataset, pointing to a first record in the second dataset that contains the first data item” at col. 8, lines 24-40, col. 4, lines 13-50;

“when processing data in the first dataset, using the first pointer to locate the first record in the second dataset, and including the first data item from the second dataset in the processing of data in the first dataset” at col. 8, lines 24-40.

As per claim 14, Chu teaches “processing the data in the first dataset that are native to the first dataset” at col. 8, lines 24-40;

“processing the data in the first dataset that are inherited from the second dataset and for which a local copy has not already been processed” at col. 8, lines 24-40, col. 4, lines 13-50, col. 7, lines 13-59;

“processing the data in the first dataset that are inherited from the third dataset and that have not already been processed during the processing of data that are inherited from the second dataset” at col. 7, lines 13-59.

As per claim 17, Chu teaches “a plurality of native data in the first database” at col. 8,

lines 24-40, col. 4, lines 13-50;

“a first pointer in the first dataset, the first pointer pointing to a first data item in a second dataset to inherit the first data item from the second dataset into the first dataset on a record level” at col. 8, lines 24-40, col. 4, lines 13-50;

“a second pointer in the first dataset, the second pointer pointing to a third pointer in a third dataset, the third pointer pointing to a second data item in a fourth dataset to inherit the second data item from the third dataset into the first dataset on a record level, the second data item further being inherited from the fourth dataset into the third dataset on a record level” at col. 8, lines 24-40, col. 4, lines 13-50;

“a fourth pointer in the first dataset, the fourth pointer pointing to a fifth dataset to inherit the fifth dataset into the first dataset on a dataset level” at col. 9, lines 25-35,

“wherein, when the system processes data in the first dataset, the system processes data that is native to the first dataset, along with the first data item, the second data item and data from the fifth dataset” at col. 8, line 24 to col. 9, line 35.

As per claim 23, Chu teaches “receiving a first user input, the first user input selecting a first data item from a first ancestor dataset for inheritance into the first dataset” at col. 4, lines 13-50, col. 8, 24-40;

“performing a first synchronization of at least a portion of the first dataset with at least a portion of a first alter-ego dataset, including sending a copy of the first data item to the first alter-ego dataset for inclusion in the first alter-ego dataset as a first alter-ego copy of the first data item” at col. 7, line 13 to col. 8, line 6, col. 8, 24-40.

As per claim 2, Chu teaches “receiving a second user input, the second user input indicating selected data items to be displayed” at col. 8, lines 24-40;

“establishing a filter for identifying the selected data items to be displayed” at col. 8, lines 24-40;

“applying the filter to the first dataset” at col. 8, lines 24-40;

“applying the filter to the first data item, using the first pointer to locate the first data item” at col. 8, lines 24-40;

“displaying data from the first dataset and from the first data item that satisfy the filter requirements” at col. 8, lines 24-40.

As per claim 3, Chu teaches “receiving a third user input, the third user input indicating changes to be made to the first data item” at col. 8, lines 50-59;

“creating a local copy of the first data item in the first dataset” at col. 8, lines 50-59;

“applying the user changes to the local copy of the first data item” at col. 8, lines 50-59.

As per claim 4, Chu teaches “the step of retaining the first pointer, pointing to the first record in the second dataset” at col. 8, lines 50-59.

As per claim 5, Chu teaches “when processing data in the first dataset, the method includes the local copy of the first data item in the processing of data in the first dataset” at col. 8, lines 50-59.

As per claim 6, Chu teaches “receiving a fourth user input, the fourth user input selecting a third dataset and indicating that the entire third dataset is to be inherited into the first dataset” at col. 4, lines 13-50;

“placing a second pointer in the first dataset, pointing to the third dataset” at col. 8, line 60 to col. 9, line 17;

“when processing data in the first dataset, using the second pointer to locate the third dataset, and including the data in the third dataset in the processing of data in the first dataset” at col. 8, line 60 to col. 9, line 17.

As per claim 7, Chu teaches “receiving a fifth user input, the fifth user input selecting a second data item from the second dataset for inheritance into the first dataset, wherein the second data item has been inherited from a fourth dataset into the second dataset, the second dataset including a fourth pointer to a second record in the fourth dataset that contains the second data item” at col. 9, lines 18-24, col. 4, lines 13-49;

“placing a third pointer in the first dataset, pointing to the fourth pointer in the second dataset” at col. 9, lines 18-24;

“when processing data in the first dataset, using the third pointer to locate the fourth pointer, using the fourth pointer to locate the second data item, and including the second data item from the fourth dataset in the processing of data in the first dataset” at col. 9, lines 18-24.

As per claim 8, Chu teaches “receiving a sixth user input, the sixth user input selecting the fourth dataset and indicating that the entire fourth dataset is to be inherited into the first

Art Unit: 2177

dataset” at col. 9, lines 25-35, col. 4, lines 13-49;

“placing a fifth pointer in the first dataset, pointing to the fourth dataset” at col. 9, lines 25-35;

“when processing data in the first dataset, using the fifth pointer to locate the fourth dataset, and including the data in the fourth dataset in the processing of data in the first dataset, but also detecting that the second data item has been inherited into the first dataset both through the second dataset and directly from the fourth dataset and avoiding processing the second data item a second time” at col. 9, lines 25-35.

As per claim 9, Chu teaches “a step of synchronizing the first dataset with an alter-ego dataset. including the first data item from the second dataset in the synchronization, so that after the synchronization the alter-ego dataset has a copy of the first data item from the second dataset” at col. 5, lines 1-18, col. 1, line 65 to col. 2, line 11, col. 3, line 37 to col. 4, line 50.

As per claim 10, Chu teaches “a local copy of the first data item is stored in the first dataset prior to the synchronization with the alter-ego dataset” at col. 3, line 37 to col. 4, line 50.

As per claim 11, Chu teaches “receiving an update to the first data item from the alter-ego dataset during the synchronization” at col. 5, lines 1-65;

“entering the update from the alter-ego dataset into the local copy of the first data item” at col. 5, lines 1-65.

As per claim 12, Chu teaches “receiving a seventh user input, the seventh user input indicating a change to be made to the first data item” at col. 5, lines 1-65;

“applying the user change to the local copy of the first data item” at col. 5, lines 1-65;

“receiving an update to the first data item from the alter-ego dataset during the synchronization” at col. 5, lines 1-65, col. 7, lines 13-59;

“resolving conflicts between the update to the first data item from the alter-ego dataset and the user change received in the seventh user input” at col. 5, lines 31-39;

“entering the update from the alter-ego dataset into the local copy of the first data item and propagating the user change from the seventh user input to the alter-ego dataset as appropriate, based on the conflict resolution” at col. 7, lines 13-59, col. 5, lines 1-64.

As per claim 13, Chu teaches “synchronizing the local copy of the first data item in the first dataset with the first data item in the second dataset simultaneously with the synchronization between the first dataset and the alter-ego dataset” at col. 5, lines 1-65;

“receiving an update to the first data item from the second dataset” at col. 5, lines 1-65;

“receiving an update to the first data item from the alter-ego dataset” at col. 5, lines 1-65;

“resolving conflicts between the updates to the first data item from the second dataset and the alter-ego dataset” at col. 5, lines 31-39;

“entering the updates into the first dataset and propagating the updates to the second dataset and the alter-ego dataset as appropriate, based on the conflict resolution” at col. 5, lines 1-65, col. 7, lines 13-59.

As per claim 15, Chu teaches “the data in the first dataset further includes data that is inherited from the third dataset and that is modified locally, and the step of processing the data in the first dataset that are inherited from the third dataset excludes data for which a local copy has already been processed” at col. 8, lines 24-40, col. 7, lines 13-59, col. 4, lines 13-50.

As per claim 16, Chu teaches “the processing of data in the first dataset includes displaying a portion of the data from the first dataset” at col. 8, lines 24-40.

As per claim 18, Chu teaches “the second dataset and the third dataset are the same dataset” at col. 8, line 24 to col. 9, line 35.

As per claim 19, Chu teaches “the second dataset and the fifth dataset are the same dataset” at col. 8, line 24 to col. 9, line 35.

As per claim 20, Chu teaches “if a user of the first dataset attempts to modify the first data item, the system creates a local copy of the first data item in the first dataset and modifies the local copy instead of the first data item in the second dataset” at col. 8, line 24 to col. 9, line 35.

As per claim 21, Chu teaches “when the system processes data in the first dataset, the system detects a duplicated inheritance of a data item and avoids processing the data item multiple times” at col. 5, lines 29-39.

As per claim 22, Chu teaches “a synchronizer and an alter-ego dataset, the synchronizer synchronizing, the first dataset with the alter-ego dataset, including the data that is native to the first dataset, the first data item, the second data item, and data from the fifth dataset” at col. 1, line 65 to col. 2, line 11, col. 5, lines 29-39, col. 3, line 37 to col. 4, line 49.

As per claim 24, Chu teaches “receiving at the first alter-ego dataset a first user change to the alter-ego copy of the first data item” at col. 5, lines 1-51;

“performing a second synchronization between the first dataset and the first alter-ego dataset, including receiving at the first dataset the first user change to the first data item” at col. 7, line 13 to col. 8, line 6;

“making a local copy of the first data item in the first dataset, and entering the first user change into the local copy of the first data item at the first dataset” at col. 5, lines 1-51, col. 7, line 13 to col. 8, line 6.

As per claim 25, Chu teaches “the step of making the local copy of the first data item in the first dataset occurs before the first synchronization between the first dataset and the first alter-ego dataset” at col. 5, lines 1-51, col. 7, line 13 to col. 8, line 6.

As per claim 26, Chu teaches “receiving at the first alter-ego dataset a second user change to the alter-ego copy of the first data item” at col. 3, line 37 to col. 4, line 50, col. 5, lines 1-18, col. 1, line 65 to col. 2, line 11;

“beginning a third synchronization between the first dataset and the first alter-ego

dataset” at col. 7, line 13 to col. 8, line 6;

“receiving at the first dataset the second user change to the first data item” at col. 7, line 13 to col. 8, line 6;

“detecting a third change to the first data item in the first ancestor dataset” at col. 7, line 13 to col. 8, line 6;

“making a local copy of the first data item in the first dataset” at col. 7, line 13 to col. 8, line 6;

“performing a conflict resolution between the second user change to the first data item and the third change to the first data item” at col. 5, lines 1-51;

“completing the third synchronization by entering the second user change into the local copy of the first data item, entering the third change into the local copy of the first data item, and propagating the third change to the first alter-ego dataset, as appropriate, based on the conflict resolution” at col. 5, lines 1-51, col. 7, line 13 to col. 8, line 6.

As per claim 27, Chu teaches “receiving at the first dataset a fourth user change to the first data item” at col. 5, lines 1-51;

“making a local copy of the first data item in the first dataset” at col. 5, lines 1-51, col. 7, line 13 to col. 8, line 6;

“entering the fourth user change to the first data item into the local copy of the first data item” at col. 5, lines 1-51, col. 7, line 13 to col. 8, line 6;

“receiving at the first alter-ego dataset a fifth user change to the alter-ego copy of the first data item” at col. 5, lines 1-51, col. 7, line 13 to col. 8, line 6;

“beginning a fourth synchronization between the first dataset and the first alter-ego dataset” at col. 8, lines 7-59;

“receiving at the first dataset the fifth user change to the first data item; performing a conflict resolution between the fourth user change to the first data item and the fifth user change to the first data item” at col. 8, lines 7-59;

“completing the fourth synchronization by entering the fifth user change into the local copy of the first data item, and propagating the fourth user change to the first alter-ego dataset, as appropriate, based on the conflict resolution” at col. 8, lines 7-59.

As per claim 28, Chu teaches “the step of placing a first pointer in the first dataset, pointing to the first data item in the first ancestor dataset” at col. 4, lines 4-58.

As per claim 29, Chu teaches “the step of displaying a portion of the first dataset to a user including the first data item” at col. 4, lines 4-58, col. 5, lines 1-64.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless:

(e) the invention was described in

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only

Art Unit: 2177

if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bodnar et al. (US Patent No. 6,295,541).

Bodnar anticipated independent claims 1, 14, 17, 23 by the following:

As per claims 1, Bodnar teaches “receiving a first user input, the first user input selecting a first data item from the second dataset for inheritance into the first dataset” at col. 7, lines 13-67, col. 17, line 27 to col. 18, line 9;

“placing a first pointer in the first dataset, pointing to a first record in the second dataset that contains the first data item” at col. 7, lines 13-67, col. 17, line 27 to col. 18, line 9;

“when processing data in the first dataset, using the first pointer to locate the first record in the second dataset, and including the first data item from the second dataset in the processing of data in the first dataset” at col. 17, line 27 to col. 18, line 9.

As per claim 14, Bodnar teaches “processing the data in the first dataset that are native to the first dataset” at col. 7, lines 13-67, col. 17, line 27 to col. 18, line 9;

“processing the data in the first dataset that are inherited from the second dataset and for which a local copy has not already been processed” at col. 7, lines 13-67, col. 17, line 27 to col. 18, line 9;

“processing the data in the first dataset that are inherited from the third dataset and that have not already been processed during the processing of data that are inherited from the second dataset” at col. 17, line 27 to col. 18, line 9.

As per claim 17, Bodnar teaches “a plurality of native data in the first database” at col. 7, lines 13-67, col. 17, line 27 to col. 18, line 9;

“a first pointer in the first dataset, the first pointer pointing to a first data item in a second dataset to inherit the first data item from the second dataset into the first dataset on a record level” at col. 7, lines 13-67, col. 17, line 27 to col. 18, line 9;

“a second pointer in the first dataset, the second pointer pointing to a third pointer in a third dataset, the third pointer pointing to a second data item in a fourth dataset to inherit the second data item from the third dataset into the first dataset on a record level, the second data item further being inherited from the fourth dataset into the third dataset on a record level” at col. 7, lines 13-67, col. 18, lines 11-39, col. 22, line 33 to col. 23, line 26;

“a fourth pointer in the first dataset, the fourth pointer pointing to a fifth dataset to inherit the fifth dataset into the first dataset on a dataset level” at col. 22, line 33 to col. 23, line 26,

“wherein, when the system processes data in the first dataset, the system processes data that is native to the first dataset, along with the first data item, the second data item and data from the fifth dataset” at col. 22, line 33 to col. 23, line 26.

As per claim 23, Bodnar teaches “receiving a first user input, the first user input selecting a first data item from a first ancestor dataset for inheritance into the first dataset” at col. 7, lines 13-67, col. 17, line 27 to col. 18, line 9;

“performing a first synchronization of at least a portion of the first dataset with at least a portion of a first alter-ego dataset, including sending a copy of the first data item to the first alter-ego dataset for inclusion in the first alter-ego dataset as a first alter-ego copy of the first

data item” at col. 7, lines 13-67, col. 17, line 27 to col. 18, line 9, col. 41, lines 11-31.

As per claim 2, Bodnar teaches “receiving a second user input. the second user input indicating selected data items to be displayed” at col. 7, lines 13-67, col. 18, lines 11-39;

“establishing a filter for identifying the selected data items to be displayed” at col. 7, lines 13-67, col. 18, lines 11-39;

“applying the filter to the first dataset” at col. 7, lines 13-67, col. 18, lines 11-39;

“applying the filter to the first data item, using the first pointer to locate the first data item” at col. 18, lines 11-39;

“displaying data from the first dataset and from the first data item that satisfy the filter requirements” at col. 18, lines 11-39.

As per claim 3, Bodnar teaches “receiving a third user input, the third user input indicating changes to be made to the first data item” at col. 19, line 40 to col. 20, line 37;

“creating a local copy of the first data item in the first dataset” at col. 19, line 40 to col. 20, line 37;

“applying the user changes to the local copy of the first data item” at col. 19, line 40 to col. 20, line 37.

As per claim 4, Bodnar teaches “the step of retaining the first pointer, pointing to the first record in the second dataset” at col. 19, line 40 to col. 20, line 37.

As per claim 5, Bodnar teaches “when processing data in the first dataset, the method includes the local copy of the first data item in the processing of data in the first dataset” at col. 19, line 40 to col. 20, line 37.

As per claim 6, Bodnar teaches “receiving a fourth user input, the fourth user input selecting a third dataset and indicating that the entire third dataset is to be inherited into the first dataset” at col. 22, line 33 to col. 23, line 26;

“placing a second pointer in the first dataset, pointing to the third dataset” at col. 22, line 33 to col. 23, line 26;

“when processing data in the first dataset, using the second pointer to locate the third dataset, and including the data in the third dataset in the processing of data in the first dataset” at col. 22, line 33 to col. 23, line 26.

As per claim 7, Bodnar teaches “receiving a fifth user input, the fifth user input selecting a second data item from the second dataset for inheritance into the first dataset, wherein the second data item has been inherited from a fourth dataset into the second dataset, the second dataset including a fourth pointer to a second record in the fourth dataset that contains the second data item” at col. 18, line 40 to col. 19, line 5;

“placing a third pointer in the first dataset, pointing to the fourth pointer in the second dataset” at col. 18, line 40 to col. 19, line 5;

“when processing data in the first dataset, using the third pointer to locate the fourth pointer, using the fourth pointer to locate the second data item, and including the second data

item from the fourth dataset in the processing of data in the first dataset” at col. 18, line 40 to col. 19, line 5.

As per claim 8, Bodnar teaches “receiving a sixth user input, the sixth user input selecting the fourth dataset and indicating that the entire fourth dataset is to be inherited into the first dataset” at col. 42, line 31 to col. 43, line 27;

“placing a fifth pointer in the first dataset, pointing to the fourth dataset” at col. 42, line 31 to col. 43, line 27;

“when processing data in the first dataset, using the fifth pointer to locate the fourth dataset, and including the data in the fourth dataset in the processing of data in the first dataset, but also detecting that the second data item has been inherited into the first dataset both through the second dataset and directly from the fourth dataset and avoiding processing the second data item a second time” at col. 42, line 31 to col. 43, line 27.

As per claim 9, Bodnar teaches “a step of synchronizing the first dataset with an alter-ego dataset. including the first data item from the second dataset in the synchronization, so that after the synchronization the alter-ego dataset has a copy of the first data item from the second dataset” at col. 41, lines 11-31.

As per claim 10, Bodnar teaches “a local copy of the first data item is stored in the first dataset prior to the synchronization with the alter-ego dataset” at col. 41, line 11 to col. 42, line 58.

As per claim 11, Bodnar teaches “receiving an update to the first data item from the alter-ego dataset during the synchronization” at col. 41, line 11 to col. 42, line 58;

“entering the update from the alter-ego dataset into the local copy of the first data item” at col. 41, line 11 to col. 42, line 58.

As per claim 12, Bodnar teaches “receiving a seventh user input,8 the seventh user input indicating a change to be made to the first data item” at col. 42, line 58 to col. 43, line 28;

“applying the user change to the local copy of the first data item” at col. 42, line 58 to col. 43, line 59;

“receiving an update to the first data item from the alter-ego dataset during the synchronization” at col. 43, line 28 to col. 44, line 44;

“resolving conflicts between the update to the first data item from the alter-ego dataset and the user change received in the seventh user input” at col. 43, line 28 to col. 44, line 44, col. 48, lines 6-13, col. 46, lines 58-67;

“entering the update from the alter-ego dataset into the local copy of the first data item and propagating the user change from the seventh user input to the alter-ego dataset as appropriate, based on the conflict resolution” at col. 43, line 28 to col. 44, line 44, col. 48, lines 6-14.

As per claim 13, Bodnar teaches “synchronizing the local copy of the first data item in the first dataset with the first data item in the second dataset simultaneously with the synchronization between the first dataset and the alter-ego dataset” at col. 45, line 7 to col. 46,

line 58;

“receiving an update to the first data item from the second dataset” at col. 46, lines 26-57;

“receiving an update to the first data item from the alter-ego dataset” at col. 46, lines 26-57;

“resolving conflicts between the updates to the first data item from the second dataset and the alter-ego dataset” at col. 46, lines 58-67;

“entering the updates into the first dataset and propagating the updates to the second dataset and the alter-ego dataset as appropriate, based on the conflict resolution” at col.46, line 58 to col. 47, line 56.

As per claim 15, Bodnar teaches “the data in the first dataset further includes data that is inherited from the third dataset and that is modified locally, and the step of processing the data in the first dataset that are inherited from the third dataset excludes data for which a local copy has already been processed” at col. 17, line 27 to col. 18, line 9.

As per claim 16, Bodnar teaches “the processing of data in the first dataset includes displaying a portion of the data from the first dataset” at col. 18, lines 11-39.

As per claim 18, Bodnar teaches “the second dataset and the third dataset are the same dataset” at col. 43, line 28 to col. 44, lines 44.

As per claim 19, Bodnar teaches “the second dataset and the fifth dataset are the same

dataset” at col. 43, line 28 to col. 44, line 44.

As per claim 20, Bodnar teaches “if a user of the first dataset attempts to modify the first data item, the system creates a local copy of the first data item in the first dataset and modifies the local copy instead of the first data item in the second dataset” at col. 45, lines 7-48.

As per claim 21, Bodnar teaches “when the system processes data in the first dataset, the system detects a duplicated inheritance of a data item and avoids processing the data item multiple times” at col. 46, line 58 to col. 47, line 56.

As per claim 22, Bodnar teaches “a synchronizer and an alter-ego dataset, the synchronizer synchronizing, the first dataset with the alter-ego dataset, including the data that is native to the first dataset, the first data item, the second data item, and data from the fifth dataset” at col. 45, lines 7-48.

As per claim 24, Bodnar teaches “receiving at the first alter-ego dataset a first user change to the alter-ego copy of the first data item” at col. 41, line 11 to col. 42, line 58;

“performing a second synchronization between the first dataset and the first alter-ego dataset, including receiving at the first dataset the first user change to the first data item” at col. 41, line 11 to col. 42, line 58;

“making a local copy of the first data item in the first dataset, and entering the first user change into the local copy of the first data item at the first dataset” at col. 45, lines 7-58.

As per claim 25, Bodnar teaches “the step of making the local copy of the first data item in the first dataset occurs before the first synchronization between the first dataset and the first alter-ego dataset” at col. 41, line 11 to col. 42, line 58.

As per claim 26, Bodnar teaches “receiving at the first alter-ego dataset a second user change to the alter-ego copy of the first data item” at col. 41, line 11 to col. 42, line 58;

“beginning a third synchronization between the first dataset and the first alter-ego dataset” at col. 41, line 11 to col. 42, line 58;

“receiving at the first dataset the second user change to the first data item” at col. 41, line 11 to col. 42, line 58;

“detecting a third change to the first data item in the first ancestor dataset” at col. 43, line 28 to col. 44, line 44;

“making a local copy of the first data item in the first dataset” at col. 43, line 28 to col. 44, line 44, col. 45, line 7-58;

“performing a conflict resolution between the second user change to the first data item and the third change to the first data item” at col. 46, lines 58-67;

“completing the third synchronization by entering the second user change into the local copy of the first data item, entering the third change into the local copy of the first data item, and propagating the third change to the first alter-ego dataset, as appropriate, based on the conflict resolution” at col. 46, line 58 to col. 47, line 67, col. 48, lines 1-13.

As per claim 27, Bodnar teaches “receiving at the first dataset a fourth user change to the

first data item” at col. 44, line 23 to col. 45, line 36, col. 17, line 27 to col. 18, line 9, col. 7, lines 13-67;

“making a local copy of the first data item in the first dataset” at col. 44, line 23 to col. 45, line 36;

“entering the fourth user change to the first data item into the local copy of the first data item” at col. 41, lines 11-31;

“receiving at the first alter-ego dataset a fifth user change to the alter-ego copy of the first data item” at col. 44, line 23 to col. 45, line 36;

“beginning a fourth synchronization between the first dataset and the first alter-ego dataset” at col. 44, line 23 to col. 45, line 36, col. 41, lines 11-31;

“receiving at the first dataset the fifth user change to the first data item” at col. 42, line 29 to col. 43, line 27;

“performing a conflict resolution between the fourth user change to the first data item and the fifth user change to the first data item” at col. 42, line 29 to col. 43, line 27;

“completing the fourth synchronization by entering the fifth user change into the local copy of the first data item, and propagating the fourth user change to the first alter-ego dataset, as appropriate, based on the conflict resolution” at col. 43, line 27 to col. 44, line 44.

As per claim 28, Bodnar teaches “the step of placing a first pointer in the first dataset, pointing to the first data item in the first ancestor dataset” at col. 7, lines 12-67.

As per claim 29, Bodnar teaches “the step of displaying a portion of the first dataset to a

Art Unit: 2177

user including the first data item” at col. 7, lines 12-67.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments regarding Boothby does not teach or suggest any sort of inheritance with respect to claims 1, 14, 17, 23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Miranda Le whose telephone number is (703) 305-3203. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene, can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax number to this Art Unit is (703) 872-9306. The TC 2100's Customer Service number is (703) 306-5631.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



Miranda Le
July 22, 2004



GRETA ROBINSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER